

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/047,458	01/14/2002	Carl S. Brown	11532-036001	1033	
7.	590 02/13/2003				
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP			EXAMINER		
11685 EL CAMINO REAL SUITE 200			KASSA, YOSEF		
SAN DIEGO, (	CA 92130		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2625	ſ	
			DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003	DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/047,458	BROWN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	YOSEF KASSA	2625			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover she	et with the correspondence ac	ddress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, my within the statutory minimum will apply and will expire SIX (6), cause the application to become	hay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered time MONTHS from the mailing date of this of me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/1	<u>14/02</u> .				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under			ne merits is		
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	wn from consideration	•			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement	÷			
Application Papers	r cicolion requirement				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are:	a)☐ accepted or b)⊠	objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a) ☐ approved b)	disapproved by the Examin	ier.		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	r priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents</li> </ol>	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received	in Application No			
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	a)).	Stage		
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	•		I application).		
a) The translation of the foreign language pro	ovisional application ha	as been received.	••		
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Notic	view Summary (PTO-413) Paper No ce of Informal Patent Application (PT r:			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Drawings**

1. New corrected drawings are required in this application because the drawing submitted is not an original drawing. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jansson et al (4,760,385) further in view of Erler et al (5,687,251).

With regard to claim 1, Jansson et al discloses collecting calibration data (that is, calibrated image pixel obtained from a look-up table col. 5, lines 17-18); determining the positioning and orthogonality errors from the calibration data (see col. 5, lines 19-22, the

-Art Unit: 2625

maximum mosiac image size is computed and displayed as a rectangular mosaic image marker).

Jansson et al did not explicitly call for creating a solution model based on positioning and orthogonality data. In the same field of endeavor, However, Erler et al (see col. 5, lines 61-col. 6, lines 1-7) teach this feature. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Erler et al specimen image processing system and into Jansson et al system. The motivation for doing so is to that, the digitizing of a specimen image obtained from a microscope or other modified to create a digital specimen image see col. 2, lines 34-40 of Erler et al.

With regard to claim 2, Erler et al disclose further comprising modifying the position an image area based on the solution model (see col. 6, lines 1-7).

With regard to claim 3, Jansson et al discloses further comprising modifying the positioning of a mechanical system to compensate for errors based on the solution model (see col. 5, lines 34-lines 17-22).

With regard to claim 4, Jansson et al discloses further comprising determining calibration data based on stepping data (see col. 5, lines 17-22).

With regard to claim 5, Jansson et al discloses further comprising determining calibration data based on slide data using a reference slide (see col. 2, lines 45-49 and Fig. 3B item 213 of Jansson et al).

With regard to claim 6, Jansson et al discloses further comprising determining calibration data based on sub-spot data (see Fig. 3B item 214).

Art Unit: 2625

With regard to claim 7, Jansson et al discloses further comprising determining calibration data based on absolute data (see col. Col. 4, lines 29-36).

With regard to claim 8, Jannson et al discloses determining calibration data; creating adjustment parameters based on the calibration data (see col. 5, lines 17-22); applying the adjustment parameters to position a first portion of the plurality of specimens within a scan area (see col. 2, lines 38-44); obtaining an image of the first portion of the plurality of specimens (see col. 2, lines 15-19); applying the adjustment parameters to position a second portion of the plurality of specimens within a scan area (see col. 2, lines 38-44); obtaining an image of the second portion of the plurality of specimens (see col. 2, lines 20-25); and combining the image of the first portion and the image of the second portion to create the image of the plurality of specimens (see col. 2, lines 20-25).

With regard to claim 9, Jansson et al discloses obtaining an image of a plurality of portions of the plurality of specimens, wherein a location of each of the plurality of portions is adjusted based on the adjustment parameters; and stitching together each of the images of the plurality of portions of the plurality of specimens (see col. 3, lines 7-15).

Claims 10-13 are similarly analyzed as claims 4-7.

With regard to claim 14, Jannsson et al discloses a staging area which moves relative to a camera (see col. 5, lines 34-37); a processor which collects calibration data from the staging area (see col. 6, lines 1-7), wherein the processor creates an

Art Unit: 2625

adjustment algorithm to modify movement of the staging area to compensate for the calibration data (see col. 5, lines 12-22).

With regard to claim 15, Jansson et al discloses wherein the calibration data is based on a bright spot within the scan area (see col. 9, lines 49-56).

With regard to claim 16, Jansson et al discloses wherein the staging area is positioned to collect a plurality of images, each of the plurality of images comprising a portion of the total desired image (see col. 3, lines 37-33).

With regard to claim 17, Jansson et al discloses wherein each of the plurality of images is assembled to form the total desired image (see col. 3, lines 7-12).

With regard to claim 18, Jansson et al discloses wherein the calibration data is obtained without the use of a reference slide (see col. 5, lines 17-20).

Claim 19 is similarly analyzed as claim 5.

#### Other Prior Art Cited

- 3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- US Patent No. (6,272,235) to Bacus et al discloses method and apparatus for creating a virtual microscope slide.
- US Patent No. (5,787,208) to Oh et al discloses image enhancement method and apparatus.
- US Patent No. (6,485,413) to Boppart et al discloses method and apparatus for forward directed optical scanning instruments.

. Art Unit: 2625

US Patent No. (6,185,444) to Ackerman et al discloses solid state magnetic

resonance imaging.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (703) 306-

5918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to

6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, BHAVESH MEHTA can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

872-9314 for regular communication and (703) 872-9314 for after Final

communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number

is (703) 306-5631. The group receptionist number for TC 2600 is (703) 305-4700.

**PATENT EXAMINER** 

Yosef Kassa

02/07/03.

Jayanti K. Patel

Page 6